

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS FO Box 1430 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.tepto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/510,942	10/08/2004	Bruce K. Jankowski	2780(203-3093)	7109
Covidien	7590 01/25/20	10	EXAMINER	
60 Middletov			CHEN, VICTORIA W	
North Haven	, CT 06473		ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			3739	
			MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			01/25/2010	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Advisory Action Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief

Application No.	Applicant(s)					
10/510,942	JANKOWSKI, BRUCE K.					
Examiner	Art Unit					
VICTORIA W. CHEN	3739					

	VICTORIA W. CHEN	3739							
The MAILING DATE of this communication appe	ears on the cover sheet with the o	orrespondence add	ress						
THE REPLY FILED 13 January 2009 FAILS TO PLACE THIS A	APPLICATION IN CONDITION FOR	R ALLOWANCE.							
application, applicant must timely file one of the following application in condition for allowance; (2) a Notice of Appl	☑ The reply was filed after a final rejection, but prior to or on the same day as filing a Notice of Appeal. To avoid abandonment of tri application, applicant must timely file one of the following replies: (1) an amendment, affidavit, or other evidence, which places th application in condition for allowance; (2) a Notice of Appeal (with appeal fee) in compliance with 37 CFR 41.31; or (3) a Reques for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114. The reply must be filed within one of the following time The reply was filed after a final rejection, but prior to or on the same day as filing a Notice of Appeal (with appeal fee) in compliance which are filed within the filed within the following time The reply was filed after a final rejection, but prior to or on the same day as filing a Notice of Appeal. To avoid abandonment of the application appears to appeal to a prior appear								
a) The period for reply expiresmonths from the mailing	date of the final rejection.								
no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire la	e period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this Advisory Action, or (2) the date set forth in the final rejection, whichever is later. In event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of the final rejection.								
MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07(Examiner Note: If box 1 is checked, check either box (a) or (b). ONLY CHECK BOX (b) WHEN THE FIRST REPLY WAS FILED WITHIN TWO MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07(f).								
Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date on which the petition under 37 CFR 1.136(a) and the appropriate extension fee have been filled is the date for purposes of determining the period of extension and the corresponding amount of the fee. The appropriate extension fee be under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the shortened statutory period for reply originally set in the final Office action; or (2) as set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of the final rejection, even if timely filled, may reduce any earmed patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.74(b).									
NOTICE OF APPEAL	" "# 07 OFD 44 07	The state of the state of the state of							
2. The Notice of Appeal was filed on A brief in compliance with 37 CFR 41.37 must be filed within two months of the date of filing the Notice of Appeal (37 CFR 41.37(a)), or any extension thereof (37 CFR 41.37(a)), to avoid dismissal of the appeal. Since Notice of Appeal has been filed, any reply must be filed within the time period set forth in 37 CFR 41.37(a).									
<u>AMENDMENTS</u>									
3. ☐ The proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection, but prior to the date of filing a brief, will not be entered because (a) ☐ They raise mew issues that would require further consideration and/or search (see NOTE below); (b) ☐ They raise the issue of new matter (see NOTE below);									
(c) ☐ They are not deemed to place the application in better form for appeal by materially reducing or simplifying the issues for appeal; and/or									
(d) ☐ They present additional claims without canceling a	corresponding number of finally reje	ected claims.							
NOTE: (See 37 CFR 1.116 and 41.33(a)).			DTOL OOA)						
4. The amendments are not in compliance with 37 CFR 1.1.		mpliant Amendment (i	OL-324).						
 Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s) Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would be all 		imals filed amandmar	st concelling the						
non-allowable claim(s).		•							
 For purposes of appeal, the proposed amendment(s): a) how the new or amended claims would be rejected is provided. 		be entered and an e	planation of						
The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows: Claim(s) allowed:									
Claim(s) objected to:									
Claim(s) rejected: 1-23.									
Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration:									
AFFIDAVIT OR OTHER EVIDENCE									
 The affidavit or other evidence filed after a final action, bu because applicant failed to provide a showing of good and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 1.116(e). 									
 The affidavit or other evidence filed after the date of filing entered because the affidavit or other evidence failed to o showing a good and sufficient reasons why it is necessary 	vercome all rejections under appea	l and/or appellant fail:	s to provide a						
10. The affidavit or other evidence is entered. An explanation of the status of the claims after entry is below or attached. REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION/OTHER									
The request for reconsideration has been considered bu See Continuation Sheet.	t does NOT place the application in	condition for allowan	ce because:						
12. Note the attached Information Disclosure Statement(s). (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s).									
13. Other:									
/Victoria W Chen/	/John P Leubecker/								
Examiner, Art Unit 3739	Primary Examiner, AU 3	739							

Continuation of 11, does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: Applicant argues that Turkel fails to disclose a pocket with an annular wall with an axial length such that the annular wall is substantially in contact with an outer surface of the surgical instrument along the substantially the length of the pocket. As seen in the Final Rejection dated 11/17/09, the examiner included element 18, and thus 18a of Turkel as being part of the surgical instrument, and defined the annular wall of the pocket as being the portion of the wall of 24, labeled as 26a in Fig. 3 which is seen being in contact with the outer surface of 18. Applicant further argues that Turkel fails to teach a substantially planar distal end wall, because the shape of the end wall [24] as shown by Turke line Figs. 2-4 is somewhat hemispherical. However, the examiner interprets the distal end wall disclosed by Turkel being substantially planar since planar is defined as "of, relating to, or lying in a plane" ["planar" Meriam-Webster Online Dictionary, 2010. Merriam-Webster Online 18 January 2010 http://www.merriam-webster.com/dictionary/planar>], and any surface if a three dimensional object is lying in a plane. The examiner further notes there is no explanation or description of the distal end wall being substantially planar in applicant's specification. Further, as shown in Figs. 2-4, the surgical instrument, including element 18, clearly stretches the distal end portion of the instrument introducer as it is advanced therethrough. Therefore, the Turkel rejections are upheld.

Applicant argues that Yoon fails to disclose a substantially planar end wall because the distal end wall [Fig. 15, end of 116] is shown as being somewhat hemispherical in shape. The examiner respectfully disagrees for the same reasons as described in the argument against the Turkel reference. Therefore, the Yoon rejection is upheld.